DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 908 CS 205 201

AUTHOR Hartwell, Patrick
TITLE "Dialect Interference" in Writing: A Critical View.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (30th, Minneapolis, MN, April 5-7, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Dialects; *Composition (Literary); Higher Education; *Interference (Language Learning); *Nonstandard Dialects; Reading Processes; *Reading Skills; Spelling; Teaching Methods; *Writing Skills; Written Language

ABSTRACT

Arguing that dialect interference in writing does not exist, this paper contends that pedagogies for teaching writing skills to native speakers of English that assume such interference are wrong. It examines arguments and evidence that support the notion of dialect interference in writing, offers counter evidence, and explores an alternative explanation for apparent dialect interference. It analyzes positions and evidence used by others to establish the existence of dialect interference, including: the common sense argument, the necessary precondition argument, the second language learning analogy, and the dialect interference in reading argument. The counter explanation offered in this paper is that apparent dialect interference in writing reveals partial or imperfect mastery of a neural coding system (the print code) that underlies both reading and writing. The implication of this analysis is that writing instruction for all students ought to be broadly rhetorical, stressing voice, audience, and purpose, rather than narrowly grammatical, stressing surface detail and its presumed connection with a spoken standard. (MKM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178908

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

'Dialect Interference' in Writing: A Critical View

Patrick Hartwell
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Conference on College Composition and Communication
Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 6, 1979

Permission to reproduce this
material has been granted by
Patrick Hartwell
to the Educational Resources
Information Center (ERIC) and
users of the ERIC system.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patrick Hartwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205201

'Dialect Interference' in Writing: A Critical View

The term 'dialect interference' in writing, as conventionally used, would seem to have the following meaning: the surface features of the spoken dialects of some native speakers of English interfere with, or inhibit, the production, in writing, of the correct forms of the accepted orthography (Edited American English, or EAE). In other words, some kids make mistakes because they don't talk right. Such 'interference' is taken to affect the writing of all speakers whose dialect departs from an assumed "Standard English" (SE), but most attention has been focused on the dialect of many black Americans, which will be identified, following Labov (1972), as the Black English Vernacular (BEV).

Errors attributed to dialect interference from BEV include the absense of terminal morphemes like the -s, -ed, and -'s markers, spelling mistakes based on BEV phonology, such as bofe for both, and nonstandard words such as expletive it for SE expletive there, as in "it's three things I want to do." One widely-cited

estimate, offered without empirical support, is that 'dialect interference' is responsible for forty per cent of the errors in the writing of speakers of BEV (Fasold, 1971).

The argument to be presented here is that such 'dialect interference in writing,' in and of itself, does not exist, and that pedagogies for teaching writing skills to native speakers of English that assume such interference are theoretically wrong, pedagogically unsound, and socially unwise. That argument will be presented by examining arguments and evidence provided to support the notion of dialect interference in writing, then offering counter-evidence and exploring an alternative explanation for apparent dialect interference in writing.

It might be useful, however, to begin with two parenthetical notes, one on the historical background of the notion of dialect interference, the second on its pedagogical implications.

'Dialect interference' is a comparatively new term--it seems to have entered composition theory in the 1960's, from the parallel use of the term in reading theory. But the notion that there is a causal relationship between

dialect and writing has long dominated literacy instruction in the United States. Correctness of spoken grammar and pronunciation were stressed by the elocution movement and thus seen, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as preconditions to correctness of surface detail in writing. In nineteenth-century terms, orthoepy precedes orthography. Nineteenth-century discussions of the issue are explicit about the social implications of the dialect question (Douglas, 1974, 1975, 1979; Lyman, 1921; Piché, 1977; Wright, 1977).

We no longer seek to eradicate students' speech forms, and our newer texts add a patina of respectability to socially nonstandard dialects and a drollop of second language methodology to their treatment of error. But these changes, from this perspective, are minor indeed, and our current texts retain the basic emphases and assumptions of texts of a hundred years ago. The influence of linguistic science has changed the vocabulary with which we discuss error, but not the approach we take to it. A pseudo-scientific term, dialect interference, has replaced a social term, orthoepy, but the change is at best cosmetic.

As a result, discussions of the assumed 'interference' of spoken dialect with writing slip inevitably into social

or political analysis, and our responses to the question of working-class literacy are charged with political values in place of neutral analysis. Conservative responses insist on the eradication of socially non-standard dialects, seen either as a necessary replacement of what J. Mitchell Morse delights in calling "illiterate dialects" (1973, 1979) or as an inevitable accompaniment of literacy (Eskey, 1976). Liberal responses are more torturous, torn between social responsibility on one hand and what is taken to be linguistic fact on the other. We must, for example, respect the spoken dialects of our students, but insist on correctness at the editing stage (Kelly, 1974); we can respect the written vernacular voice in some contexts, riddled though it is with interference, while insisting on EAE in other contexts (Linn, 1975); we must grant the logical adequacy of nonstandard dialects, yet still accept the teaching of EAE as a cultural responsibility (D'Eloia, 1975).

In such a politically-charged context, some arguments seem far too radical and even too abstract, sadly out of touch with the practical needs of the basic writing student, seen as trapped by the surface features of his or her dialect. Such radical arguments include

Geneva Smitherman's suggestion that we offer a hierarchy of goals, minimizing grammatical detail (Smitherman, 1977), James Sledd's stress on the abstract nature of print literacy (Sledd, 1976), and the speculations about the cultural and historical dimensions of literacy by cognitive theorists such as Lev Vygotsky or David Olson (Vygotsky, 1962, 1978; Olson, 1977a, 1977b).

There's a further implication to this issue, an unpleasant one that has largely been ignored: if speakers of socially nonstandard dialects have an extra learning task in mastering literacy, that of mastering a spoken 'Standard English," they will inevitably be less successful than speakers of Standard English. Thus the assumption of dialect interference in writing, like the more general deficit assumptions discussed by Labov (1969), leads back to the point that political liberals were anxious to avoid: it justifies the systematic failure of educational institutions to transmit literacy to working-class students by blaming the students rather than the institutions.

ARGUMENTS FOR DIALECT INTERFERENCE IN WRITING

The stakes, then, are rather high: at issue are not only pedagogies for teaching writing and the paradigms of human learning that underlie them, but complex racial, social, and political issues as well. But formal discussion of dialect interference has been rare, most commentators preferring to assume such 'interference,' and to deal instead with its pedagogical implications (for example, Campbell & Meier, 1976; Gray, 1975; Rockas, 1977).

It would seem worthwhile, therefore, to set out the arguments and evidence that might be used to establish the existence of dialect interference. These arguments will be shown to be consistently vulnerable in detail, in fact weakest where they would seem to be most strong.

The Argument from Common Sense

The most widely accepted argument for dialect interference in writing would seem to be "common sense," judging from the lack of formal discussion and from informal talks with teachers. Students say "bofe" and they write bofe; they say "he tall" and they write he tall. It's simply common sense that the one causes the other.

There's a primitive attractiveness to this argument; it has the surface simplicity that post hoc ergo prompter hoc arguments always have. It should be clear, however, that common sense alone, without more analytic support, is inadequate to support such a crucial position. (One might imagine a doctor, on a similar common sense basis, mistaking the symptom for the disease--perhaps treating measles by painting the spots.)

The Necessary Precondition Argument

A more sophisticated version of the argument from common sense is the necessary precondition argument. Productive control over the grammar and pronunciation of an assumed spoken standard, it is argued, is a necessary precondition for correctness of detail in writing. Again, orthoepy precedes orthography; you've got to talk right before you can write right. The argument is familiar from what must be called, following Mencken (1926), the "schoolma'am tradition," despite the sexist overtones of that term. The outlines of this tradition are clear enough: beginning writers will be unable to spell library if they slovenly say "liberry," or government if they say "guv'm'nt," and a spoken "he don't" will lead inexorably to a written he don't.

E. D. Hirsch, Jr.'s Philosophy of Composition (1977) offers the fullest statement of the necessary precondition argument. Hirsch follows Bradley (1904) in asserting that the written standard, EAE, has "fixed" the grammar and even phonology of the spoken standard, SE, and this connection is reasserted as a causal relationship:

> For instance, orthoepy--the teaching of a single "correct" form of pronunciation--has been carried to unnecessary extremes. But the conservatism implied by such teaching . . . is absolutely essential to the persistence of the written language as an intelligible oral medium. (p. 39)

In this view, socially nonstandard dialects must grow to approximate an assumed standard dialect, and the speaker of a dialect such as BEV is an unfortunate victim of a resistless tide of linguistic normalization.

It's tempting to respond to the necessary precondition argument by reference to bare fact: if mastery of literacy were dependent on mastery of a single variety of spoken English, an assumed "Standard English," then written English could not be a functioning national language in Nigeria, Australia, India, the Phillippines, Liberia, Kenya, and Ireland, much less Texas and Maine.

More seriously, the assumptions of Hirsch (and Bradley) about the direction of language change seem untrue (Douglas, 1978; Stockwell & Macaulay, 1972). Indeed, spelling-based pronunciations in modern American English, such as /kalm/ in place of /kam/ for calm and /ɔftən/ for often, are hyperurbanisms, created not by the literate middle class, but by the linguistically insecure upper working class (Labov, 1966).

It may well be, then, that the necessary precondition argument has its causal relationships backward: mastery of print literacy may affect speech more than speech affects mastery of print literacy. In this view, we don't write as we speak (and thus commit "dialect interference"); rather, we speak as we write. Historical studies and research findings support this conclusion. John Hurt Fisher (1977) cites historical evidence of print forms affecting spoken English grammar and pronunciation. Carol Chomsky (1972) has shown a direct correlation in seven- to nine-year-olds between reading exposure and mastery of certain syntactic forms. And Irene Moscowitz (1973) concludes that oral competence in controlling adjective/noun patterns such as

divine::*divinity* and *serene*::*serenity* is a factor of having internalized that aspect of the spelling system.

It is difficult, therefore, to accept the necessary precondition argument in the generalized form in which it is offered. It may well be, of course, that a fully-elaborated version of the argument might answer specific questions: for example, why the spoken forms of *library* and *government* must match their print equivalents while the spoken forms of *answer*, *knot*, and *of* need not; or why a working-class Midland intrusive /r/, as in "warsh" for *wash*, is counterproductive while an upper-class Boston intrusive /r/, as in "Cuber" for *Cuba*, apparently is not; or why a twentieth-century American working class "he don't" is non-functional when a nineteenth-century British upper class "he don't" appears not to have been. Such elaborated arguments, however, have not been provided.

The Argument from Interference in Second Language Learning

"Language interference" in second language learning is well-documented. The syntactic and phonological features of one's native language interfere with the learning of a second language after about age six. It

is commonly argued that mastering print literacy is exactly analogous to learning a second language (Allen, 1966; Lin, 1965; Reed, 1973). That is, a well-formed concept in second language learning is transferred to a supposedly analogous case in first language learning.

The argument from analogy to second language learning, like the common sense and necessary precondition arguments, again posits the productive control of a spoken standard as a precondition to mastery of print, and it leads to pedagogies that adapt the contrastive drills of second language learning to the teaching of writing. This pedagogy is perhaps the dominant one at the present time, with texts and programs available at elementary, secondary, and college levels (for example, Feigenbaum, 1971; Gefvert, et al., 1975); its key word, bidialectalism, is analogous to the well-defined bilingualism. Such enlightened liberalism, in the view of its supporters, no longer denies the students' vernacular; rather, it supplements it, by means of contrastive drills, with the accepted forms of "Standard English," thus opening to students the language of print.

There are two levels of analogy in this argument: one asserting that mastering Edited American English

is analogous to mastering a second dialect, that is, SE, the other asserting that mastering such a dialect is analogous to learning a second language.

Neither analogy is valid. It is precisely the nature of a written standard to be adialectical. The written standard minimizes intonation contours and supplants oral cues to meaning with the tacit markers of punctuation. The phonetic representations of speech are abstract phonemic representations in written English, as Chomsky and Halle (1968) point out with such patterns as sign::signal and telegraph::telegraphic::telegraphy, where spelling preserves meaning rather than the phonology of any dialect. A written form such as the past tense marker -ed codes four spoken forms, /t/ as in walked, /d/ as in changed, /əd/ as in rounded, and the null realization /Ø/ as in the relaxed standard pronunciation of "I walked to the store." It appears, from Beers and Henderson's (1977) study of first-grade spelling, that such abstract written forms are gradually realized as reading ability improves, without reference to spoken norms. Written English is not a dialect.

Nor is mastering literacy analogous to learning a language. Functioning bidialectals are a rare breed,

and some linguists have ventured to doubt that they exist (Kochman, 1969), while functioning bilinguals are common, as are people who master both a spoken dialect and a written code, the latter, at least, among the middle class. It would seem best, therefore, to discard any naive analogy between print literacy and a dialect as such. Print literacy might be conceived, following structuralist literary critics (Barthes, 1975; Derrida, 1976) as a complex cultural code, or, following European linguists, as a form of language distinct from speech (Vatchek, 1973), or even, to follow the suggestive lead of Vygotsky (1962), as a mode of thought itself.

It is interesting to note, in this regard, that the notion of "language interference" has been increasingly questioned as an explanatory concept in second language learning (Dulay & Burt, 1974; Schacter & Celce-Muria, 1977). Many second-language theorists argue that apparent areas of interference between language and language are less crucial to second language learning than rhetorical issues of the forms and structures of communication (Kaplan, 1972) and the cultural pragmatics of social interaction (Schumann, 1976; Hatch, 1978), thus turning the analogy back upon itself and suggesting that second-language teaching methodologies borrow from the

rhetorical and sociolinguistic insights of first-language learning. In a review article, Hakuta and Cancino (1977) cite studies estimating the percentage of error caused by language interference in second language learning to be roughly five per cent, leaving us with ninety-five per cent of language learning errors to explain in some other way. Kroll and Schafer (1978) suggest that ESL error-analysis may have direct relevance to the teaching of composition.

Here again, it is of course possible that arguments for dialect interference in writing could be developed beyond the level of naive analogy, and it is possible that such dialect interference might be correlated, in detail, with studies of "language interference." Such elaborated arguments, however, have not been provided, leaving the analogy with second language learning both abstract and unconvincing.

The Argument from Dialect Interference in Reading

The term 'dialect interference' enters the teaching of writing from its development in reading theory in the early 1960's (though, as has been noted, the concept itself is much older). Again, a simple transfer of concepts is involved: if the surface features of

grammar and pronunciation interfere with reading, then of course they will interfere with writing. Certainly the poor reading performance of BEV-speaking children was well-documented by 1960, and the notion of dialect interference in reading was supported by studies of oral reading performance, in which the strong influence of spoken dialect was noted.

More recent studies, however, have caused many reading theorists to doubt the validity or importance of dialect interference in reading. Even second-grade BEV-speaking children show receptive competence, if not productive control, of SE distinctions such as "the fish swim" and "the fish swims" (Torrey, 1971). BEV-speaking children do not seem to read texts written in BEV better than they read texts in EAE, seen by investigators as "Standard English," although the dialect interference hypothesis would predict that they should (Gay, 1976; Liu, 1976; Marwit, 1974; Simons & Johnson, 1974; Simons, 1974; Sims, 1976). Kenneth Goodman revised an earlier position about dialect interference, concluding that no dialect appeared to impede reading (Goodman & Buck, 1973). Other researchers have criticized earlier studies for equating production (obviously related to dialect) with comprehension, arguing

that "we have no empirical evidence for or against dialect interference in reading" (Weber, 1970, p. 131) but strong theoretical reasons to doubt its existence (Burke, 1973).

The issue of dialect interference in reading is by no means resolved (see review articles by Hall & Turner, 1974; Harber & Bryen, 1976; and Somerville, 1975). It seems safe, however, to conclude 1) that many reading theorists do not feel that dialect, as such, is a factor in learning to read; 2) that most reading theorists would agree that the empirical evidence purporting to show dialect interference is at best inconclusive; and 3) that all reading theorists (and linguists and anthropologists) would agree that interference from dialect in learning to read is far less important than such affective issues as teacher attitudes to socially nonstandard dialects, teacher comprehension of such dialects, the relationship of dialect to social class and to self-esteem, and such other factors as nutrition, availability and interest level of reading materials, and community tolerance for reading. (For representative studies of teacher attitudes to language, see Choy & Dodd, 1976; Crowl & MacGinite, 1974; McDermott, 1976;

and the bibliography of Harber & Beatty, 1978; for specific studies of teacher attitudes to written English, see Harris, 1977; Piché, et al., 1978; and Shaughnessy, 1976.)

It appears, then, that teachers of writing have again borrowed, by analogy, a view of "interference" that is no longer held by most theorists in the field from which the analogy is drawn. Moreover, it is precisely those pedagogical emphases that are most seriously questioned in reading theory that are not being questioned in writing theory. Psycholinguistic theories of reading stress the importance of productive guesses, even the necessity of error in learning (Goodman & Goodman, 1977), but most pedagogies for developmental writing still begin with surface accuracy as a primary concern. Cognitive psychologists now stress the importance of abstract schema in reading, of reading "from the top down" (see the review article by Kintgen, 1977), yet most pedagogies for teaching writing still move from the bottom up, beginning with grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

Empirical Evidence for Dialect Interference

It would seem an easy matter to provide empirical documentation of the nature and the extent of dialect

interference in writing, if such interference were as important as current pedagogies assert. And indeed a number of studies have attempted to quantify dialect interference in writing. Two features mark most of these studies. One is the lack of empirical controls: writing samples are gathered from black students and analyzed for errors "caused by" dialect interference, usually without verifying the features of the students' spoken dialect, without considering control samples from speakers of other dialects, and without considering other relevant variables (such as reading ability, for example). The other is the curious sense of failure in such studies--dialect interference never quite works in the systematic way it was expected to work. Funkhouser (1976) examined the writing of black community college students and found that "the conventions of writing force the dialect features to undergo regular changes." Rayburn (1974) found the writing of third- and fifth-grade black students to be closer to "Standard English" than their spoken productions. Terrebone (1975) examined the writing of black college students, all presumably speakers of BEV, and found "a wide divergence in linguistic performance among the informants," a divergence that would not be expected in their spoken dialects.

Whiteman (1976), using National Assessment data from blacks and whites as well as written and oral samples, hypothesized that some writers--blacks--show in writing both dialect interference and "a non-dialect-specific tendency to omit marked features," while other writers--whites--make the same errors due only to the latter cause.

Typical of such studies is Fasold and Whiteman (1971). Nineteen compositions written by tenth-grade black students were examined for errors assumed to be caused by dialect interference. The authors argue that "we can expect some interference in the writing of the Black English speaker unless there is some specific training to limit its influence in writing" (p. 35--italics added; the clause will be repeated several times), noting that this learning task "must be added to the traditional teaching of writing skills" (p. 35). But the data presented consistently undermine any reasonable interpretation of their initial hypothesis. Fewer than half of the students omitted third person singular present tense -s, a total of nineteen per cent of the potential occurences, while omission of the possessive -'s was "less noticeable" (p. 56), and only four of the samples omitted -s plurals (but in these samples the plural marker was omitted in forty-four per

cent of the plural constructions). All students, according to the authors, were speakers of BEV, yet the entry of dialect into writing--"interference," if you will--seemed remarkably idiosyncratic, affecting some subjects much more than others.

The same sort of randomness of entry was evident with other features of the spoken dialect. Be-deletion appeared in nine per cent of the possible occurences, but habitual be (as in "he be busy") did not appear. Consonant cluster reduction of the form tes for test did not appear, but reduction of looked to look and puzzled to puzzle (seen by the authors as consonant cluster reduction) did appear intermittently, an anomaly explained with the undeveloped claim that -ed endings are "more susceptible to interference" (p. 38). Similarly, some misspellings are evidence of dialect interference, such as pen for pin, but other misspellings--stomack for stomach and pastuer for pasture--are explained by "factors which cause all students learning to write English to misspell" (p. 37). All in all, it is difficult to see the explanatory force that the notion of dialect interference in writing has, given the variety in performance of speakers of the same dialect and the apparently idiosyncratic entry into writing of dialect features.

Indeed, when control samples of writing from speakers of other dialects are compared with samples of writing from speakers of BEV, any systematic notion of dialect interference becomes untenable. Sternglass (1974a, 1974b) analyzed errors made by black and white college remedial students. Black students made quantitatively more errors, but errors of the same kind and in the same proportion as the white students. Kirschner and Poteet (1973) analyzed errors in the writing of 109 community college students and found, "there were no significant differences between the black, white, and Hispanic students on the distribution of non-standard usage categories and their relative frequency"(p. 335).

Further emprical evidence to contradict the 'dialect interference' hypothesis in writing can be provided by contrasting telephone identification of the race of a speaker (a matter of spoken dialect) with the identification of the race of the writer of a written sample. If dialect interference in writing exists, the reliability of identification would be similar, for features of the spoken dialect would inexorably seep into writing, "unless there is some specific training to limit its influence." Teachers and adults generally achieve high reliability in identifying black speakers from telephone or taped

conversations--93 per cent accuracy in one study, 84 per cent accuracy from a seven-second exposure in another (Anshen, 1972; Bryden, 1968; Stroud, 1956). Yet Piché, et al. (1978), even using "idealized" BEV features intruded into essays written by white students, found that pre-service and in-service teachers could achieve only chance racial identification, and this author, in informal tests using controlled samples from National Assessment data with experienced high school and college teachers, has found the same result--purely chance identification of the race of the writer. This result would seem to be in direct conflict with the hypothesis of dialect interference as a cause of error in writing.

It would appear, then--to summarize at this point--that there is no valid empirical evidence to support the assumption that the surface features of spoken dialect are a significant cause of error in student writing, and that other arguments offered to support the assumption are either logically insufficient, questionable in their theoretical bases, or so general in form as to be meaningless. Dialect interference in writing does not exist.

A COUNTER-EXPLANATION: THE PRINT CODE

All apparent dialect interference in writing is reading-related. More precisely, apparent dialect interference in writing reveals partial or imperfect mastery of a neural coding system that underlies both reading and writing. That is to say, writers turn to the surface features of the phonology and grammar of their spoken dialect when they do not have available mental equivalents of the print forms. This hypothesis posits a single, and rather abstract, cause for errors conventionally treated as distinct, such as the spellings stomack for stomach and look for looked, and it asserts that systematic error in writing is correlated with reading disfunction, both reflecting an imperfectly developed neural coding system, the print code.

The term print code, as used here, is seen to identify a layered set of cognitive abilities, stretching from matters of surface detail to abstract expectations and strategies for processing print as reader and writer. Literate readers and writers, for example, have mastered the meaning relationships signalled by punctuation, while developing readers and writers will exhibit, in their writing and in their reading, only partial mastery of

of that system (Hartwell, 1978). Similarly, literate readers and writers have neural lexicons that reflect the meaning relationships signalled by English orthography--divine::divinity, and so on--while marginal literates, it would seem, must rely on separate, and sound-based, lexicons. The terminal morphemic system of English orthography might be expected to present particular problems for all developing reader/writers, since that system bears only marginal connection to the phonetic system--the abstract spelling -ed for the past tense /t/ in looked or the Germanic -ach buried in the /ək/ of stomach. The print code is further seen to extend hierarchically to expectations that are broadly rhetorical: expectations about the stylistic and paradigmatic structures of discursive prose, expectations about mode, voice, tone, and inference.

Three arguments will be developed to support this hypothesis. Studies of good and poor readers will be examined, to show that reading errors made by poor readers correlate with writing errors made by developing writers. The 'direct access theory' of reading will be examined for its implications for the teaching of writing. Finally, it will be shown that the print code hypothesis

has several implications that are supported by other areas of research on the teaching of writing, implications which would not follow from the dialect interference hypothesis.

Such elaborate analysis may seem far removed from the day-to-day concerns of the basic writing teacher. It is, however, precisely because writing teachers have not subjected basic assumptions to systematic analysis that we find ourselves stuck, as a matter of "common sense," with assumptions that may be less than accurate as descriptions of our students' skills. The dialect interference hypothesis, and the teacher attitudes and expectations that develop from it, seem so ingrained in textbooks, pedagogies, and professional discussion that a full analysis is desirable.

Studies of Good and Poor Readers

The print code hypothesis presupposes a close correlation between writing ability and reading ability, a correlation that goes beyond our conventional recognition that reading and writing are somehow connected (Applebee, 1977). Therefore, studies of good and poor readers

can be expected to provide interesting, if indirect, parallels with what we know of good and poor writers. Such is indeed the case.

Broadly speaking, good readers are better at tasks that are cognitive or abstract, but no better at tasks which are sound-related (that is to say, dialect-related) or lower level (Golinkoff, 1976). At the beginning level, good readers are better at responding to semantic and syntactic information, while poorer readers must sound out each word, reading with list intonation (Menyuk, 1976). Good and poor readers, in most tests, perform similarly on spoken presentations, but poor readers do worse on written presentations, because, Guthrie and Tyler (1976) suggest, they are incompletely decoding during silent reading--just as poor writers code information incompletely. Some investigators, for example Perfetti and Goldman (1976), have argued that poor readers have general problems in linguistic processing, which would support dialect interference hypotheses in reading and writing, but Carol Chomsky (1972) provides evidence to show that such general linguistic ability is a developmental function of kind and variety of reading, as the code hypothesis would predict. In a study of the spelling of second- through fifth-graders, good spellers did better on

words and nonsense words that used orthographic patterns which had no direct regard to sound (such as comma and coma), while poor spellers did better on words and nonsense words that could be coded phonologically (Schwartz & Doehring, 1977). A study of the misreadings of poor readers found a quite different pattern of phonological error in reading as opposed to listening: reading errors were associated with vowels and final consonants, while listening errors were evenly divided between initial and final consonants (Shankweiler & Liberman, 1972). Good readers are better at partial letter clues, a 'code' function (Samuels, et al., 1975); they are better at making inferences from their reading; and, in a study of fifth-grade males, good readers were better at retaining information about tense and number (Waller, 1976), information carried for the most part by the terminal morphemic system.

Such data suggest that poor readers are indeed trapped by the phonology and syntax of their dialect--not because it "interferes" with reading, but because they have not developed the ways of escaping it that more skillful readers have developed. Moreover, such data suggest that good readers are not particularly better at processing spoken "Standard English," except at processing

distinctions that arise from knowing how to read. But good readers are better at processing print at the level of abstract code--inferences, orthography, semantic and syntactic clues. One would expect, from the dialect interference hypothesis, that similar problems would occur in processing spoken "Standard English" and the written print code, but such is not the case.

The Direct Access Hypothesis in Reading Theory

The direct access hypothesis in reading theory, most strongly argued by Smith (1978), asserts that skilled readers process print directly to meaning; phonological processing, even syntactic processing, are available as alternate, and clearly secondary, strategies. The direct access theory is controversial, but it has interesting implications for notions of dialect interference in reading and, by extension, in writing. If skilled readers process print directly into meaning, then the phonological, even syntactic, features of spoken dialect cannot interfere with skilled reading. Less skilled readers, course, must rely more on syntactic and phonological processing, which may at times cause error--not because dialect causes error, but because readers are learning to read: they are mastering the code.

The range of evidence to support the direct access theory is rather impressive--and only samples will be provided. It's easier to read a word than a corre-

sponding number of letters:

that

thrg

It's very difficult to read a sentence which can be processed phonologically but not syntactically:

The none tolled hymn she had scene bear feat in her rheum.

Skilled readers retain little information about the syntactic form of sentences they read, but a great deal about their meaning (Franks & Bransford, 1974). Bilingual French- and English-speaking readers, reading sentences with mixed English and French words, often substituted the word in one language for the word printed in another (Kolers, 1972). Skilled readers read at a rate far beyond the possibility of phonological or acoustic coding. (For fuller discussion, see Bradshaw, 1975, La Berge & Samuels, 1974, and Green & Shallice, 1976.)

This view of reading is often called the "top-down" theory, for it supposes that skilled readers process a text from the top down rather than the bottom up. That is, the theory holds that readers do not read letter by letter, translating letters to sounds to words to syntactic categories to meaning, but rather read by connecting the semantics of the text with

abstract schema and prior mental knowledge (for discussion, see Kintgen, 1977, and Wittrock, 1977).

The general position is supported by comparative studies of reading and by brain studies. Japanese Kanji ideographs have no direct phonological information; it is argued that they convey "meaning . . . to the cerebral cortex without any sort of decoding or spelling out process" (Makita, 1976). Park and Arbuckle (1977) find that Korean ideographic script is processed as a picture. Marshall and Newcombe (1973) find that errors by dyslexics are semantic for some patients ("suit" for "coat," "speak" for "talk") suggesting semantic coding rather than phonological coding, and Shallice and Warrington (1975) study a patient with an acquired neurological lesion who was able to read though unable to code words phonetically (a condition also observed in deaf-and-dumb readers). Brain blood flow photographs, made in Sweden, show quite different patterns of brain activity in speaking, oral reading, and silent reading (Ingvar & Schwartz, 1974; Lassen, et al., 1978).

The direct access theory has some direct implication for the teaching of basic writing. Attempts to remediate apparent dialect interference by stressing sound/writing

connections solely at the surface level, as in traditional grammar or second-language-based pedagogies, would seem to be counterproductive, limiting the student's conscious attention to surface detail when he needs most to escape from such limitations. In other words, such pedagogies offer bottom-up models, which distort the actual practice of literate adults.

Correlates of the Print Code Hypothesis

The print code hypothesis can be supported by correlative data from other areas of the study of teaching writing, for several implications follow from the print code hypothesis that do not follow from the dialect interference hypothesis. 'Dialect interference' is an isolated disease, one that is sure to infect the writing of all working-class students, "unless there is some specific training to limit its influence" (to again cite Fasold & Whiteman, 1971); the print code hypothesis suggests some larger coherence in the gradual mastery of adult literacy.

First, the print code hypothesis would predict that blacks, who score lower on reading tests than do whites, will make more errors in writing than whites, for it posits an underlying set of cognitive skills affecting both reading and writing. However, the print code hypothesis would predict

that such errors would be similar in nature to the errors of non-BEV speakers. Those predictions are supported by the empirical studies cited above (Sternglass, 1974a, 1974b).

Second, it's predictable from the print code hypothesis that errors showing apparent 'dialect interference' would correlate quite well with errors unrelated to dialect--errors in punctuation, errors in homonyms, errors in the terminal morphemic structure of print, such as, to cite a student example, examine for examination. That prediction would seem intuitively correct to most basic writing teachers, and it would seem possible to examine error counts, extending back at least to Hoyt (1906), in the hopes of deriving a broadly universal pattern of errors made by all learners. (Such a pattern, one might predict, would have little relationship to sequences of skills teaching.) A rather exhaustive search of the historical literature, however, reveals a curious fact: it is for all practical purposes impossible to compare one error count with another. The notion of error itself seems to have no empirical validity, and thus all words in the phrase, "errors caused by dialect interference," lack an accepted meaning. At the very least, however, the

probable correlation between errors caused by apparent dialect interference and errors reflecting imperfect mastery of the print code would suggest a possible single cause for such errors, a cause unrelated to dialect as such.

Third, it's predictable from the print code hypothesis that basic writing students, when asked to read their writing in a formal situation, say into a tape recorder, will make fewer errors in their reading than in their writing. That is, poor writing ability and poor reading ability will cancel each other out, and the distinctions that are not put into writing will not be noticed as missing in reading. The experience of most teachers who have used tape recorders suggests that this is true. Anecdotal evidence for the claim has been provided (Hartwell, in press); more controlled experiments might easily be designed.

Fourth, if reading and writing abilities are distinct from spoken dialect, it's predictable that spoken and written competences might develop at different rates, overlapping to a degree, but still independent of each other (where the dialect interference hypothesis would suggest that they would be closely related). Here again, a wide range

of studies of oral and written language development (summarized in Harris, 1977) suggest, in Harris's words, that "written task attainment may neither parallel nor strictly reflect oral task attainment" (p. 130).

Fifth, and perhaps most interestingly, the notion of an abstract print code only partially available to basic writing students would lead to the prediction that errors in surface detail that reflect reference to spoken language would correlate with patterns of organization and development that would also be parasitic upon speech. Here, again, most teachers of basic writing classes would agree intuitively. Persuasive patterns available to basic writing students are those of their speech and of the popular media--sincerity, the commonplace, and, particularly, the representative narrative. Mina Shaughnessy (1977) is acute in characterizing these available rhetorical strategies: "the substitution of common wisdom in the form of platitudes or routine affirmations for careful individual inquiry and the drift from stated general purposes toward personal reverie" (pp. 230-231).

Sixth, while the dialect interference hypothesis would lead us to predict, to again cite Fasold and Whiteman (1971), that "we can expect some interference in the

writing of the Black English speaker unless there is some specific training to limit its influence in writing" (p. 35), the print code hypothesis would predict that mere exposure to the code would aid in mastery of the code. In this case, the research evidence is clear-cut in regard to both reading and writing: reading helps learners to master reading, and writing helps learners to master writing. Carol Chomsky (1972) documents the importance of fluency and variety in reading, and James Kinneavy (in press) has provided a full set of references to the value of practice in writing.

Finally, the print code hypothesis suggests that close attention to presumed links (or missing links) between spoken dialect and surface detail in writing would be counterproductive. In this view, developing writers need to escape from sound as soon as possible. Here we have a hundred years of empirical support, showing that instruction in rote grammar, of whatever kind, is at best of less value than writing practice and at worst actually harmful to the development of writing ability (Braddock, et al., 1963; Elley, et al., 1976; Meckel, 1963; Petrosky, 1977; Sherwin, 1969; Strom, 1960). It would seem unlikely that newer 'bidialectal' pedagogies--which only dress traditional grammar in the borrowed clothes of ESL methodology--would be more effective.

The argument presented here--that all apparent 'dialect interference in writing' is reading-related, reflecting partial mastery of the print code--needs to be carefully qualified. Language interference, again, is well-documented, and speakers of English as a second language--many Hispanic Americans, for example--may well show language interference in writing. Similarly, one study of the interference of American Sign Language on the syntax of the writing of a deaf student suggests that legitimate 'code interference' may well exist (Barwick, 1979). It may well be that some features of the print code, learned tacitly by younger learners, need to be taught explicitly to adult learners--an example would be the connection between the spoken /t/ at the end of looked and its abstract realization in print as -ed. Thus it might even be possible to isolate specific areas of legitimate 'dialect interference in writing'--although such analysis would have to be of a kind significantly different from the assumptions of most current studies of the relationship of speech and writing.

IMPLICATIONS

Perhaps the issue of 'dialect interference in writing' might be rephrased in these terms: what is

the point of entry of speech into writing? The dialect interference hypothesis posits a 'proper' level of entry for speakers of SE, but a very low level of entry for speakers of socially nonstandard dialects: for these speakers, speech enters at the level of phonological and syntactic coding; it causes "errors," and it's bad, something that requires "specific training to limit its influence." The print code posits a high level of entry: speech enters at the level of written "voice," rhetorical strategy, authorial purpose, and social context. And it's good. Indeed, when students begin to master literacy, it's all they've got.

The implication of this analysis is that writing instruction, for all students, ought to be broadly rhetorical, stressing voice, audience, and purpose, rather than narrowly grammatical, stressing surface detail and its presumed connection with a spoken standard. Print is a code, not a dialect, and one learns that code best from the top down, not from the bottom up.

These assumptions seem well within a developing paradigm for the teaching of writing (Warnock, 1976; Winterowd, 1975; Young, 1978), and they are supported

by recent research in reading theory and in cognitive psychology. There's some indication that they are beginning to filter down to our treatment of the developmental writer.

Thus it seems important to discard the notion of dialect interference in writing. What appears, under the dialect interference hypothesis, as a major obstacle to learning, the student's verbal language skills, becomes, under the code hypothesis, the student's major strength. Instead of verbally deprived, "nonstandard" people, we would see competent adults; instead of giving them the gift of "Standard English," we must work with them to solve the many codes of literate print discourse.

REFERENCES

Allen, R. L. Written English is a 'second language.' English Journal, 1966, 55, 739-746.

Anshen, F. Some statistical bases for the existence of black English. Florida FL Reporter, Spring/Summer, 1972, 10, 19-20.

Applebee, A. N. Writing and reading. Journal of Reading, 1977, 10, 534-537.

Barthes, R. S/Z. New York: Hill & Wang, 1975.

Barwick, J. Teaching college English to the hearing-impaired. College English, 1978, 40, 425-431.

Beers, J. W., & Henderson, E. H. A study of developing orthographic concepts among first graders. Research in the Teaching of English, 1977, 11, 133-148.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. Research in written composition. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Bradley, H. The making of English. London, 1904.

Bradshaw, J. L. Three interrelated problems in reading: A review. Memory and Cognition, 1975, 3, 123-134.

Bryden, J. D. An acoustic and social dialect analysis of perceptual vari.oles in listener identification and rating of Negro speakers. 1968. ERIC ED 022 186.

Burke, C. Dialect and the reading process. In J. L. Laffey and R. Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1973.

Campbell, D. S., & Meier, T. R. A design for a developmental writing course for academically underprepared black students. Basic Writing, 1976, 1, 20-30.

Chomsky, C. Stages in language development and reading exposure. Harvard Educational Review, 1972, 42, 1-33.

Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. The sound pattern of English. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Choy, S. J., & Dodd, D. H. Standard English-speaking and nonstandard English-speaking children: Comprehension of both dialects and teacher's evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1976, 68, 184-193.

Crowl, T. K., & MacGinitie, W. H. The influence of students' speech characteristics on teachers' evaluations of oral answers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 304-308.

D'Eloia, S. Teaching standard written English. Basic Writing, 1975, 1, 5-13.

Derrida, J. Of grammatology. Trans. Gayatri Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Pr., 1976.

Douglas, W. W. Barrett Wendell and the contradictions of composition. Arizona English Bulletin, February, 1974, 16, 182-190.

Douglas, W. W. Rhetoric for the meritocracy. In R. Ohmann, English in America. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1975.

Douglas, W. W. Review of E. D. Hirsch, Philosophy of composition. College English, 1978, 40, 90-99.

Douglas, W. W. Why know our history? English Journal, April, 1979, 68, no. 4, 16-21.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 1974, 8, 129-136.

Elley, W. B., et al. The role of grammar in a secondary English curriculum. Research in the Teaching of English, 1976, 10, 5-21.

Eskey, D. E. Standard versus nonstandard English: Toward a balanced view. English Journal, 1976, 65, no. 3, 28-31.

Fasold, R. What can an English teacher do about non-standard dialects? The English Record, 1971, 21, 82-91.

Fasold, R., & Whiteman, M. The role of dialect interference in composition. Florida FL Reporter, Spring/Fall, 1971, 9, 34-38.

Feigenbaum, I. Using foreign language methodlogy to teach standard English: Evaluation and adaption. Florida FL Reporter, Spring/Summer, 1971, 9, 116-122, 156.

Fisher, J. H. Chancery and the emergence of standard written English in the fifteenth century. Speculum, 1977, 52, 870-899.

Franks, J. J., & Bransford, J. D. Memory for syntactic form as a function of semantic content. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1974, 103, 1037-1039.

Funkhouser, J. L. Black English: From speech to writing. Diss., St. Louis University, 1976.

Gay, J., & Tweney, R. D. Comprehension and production of standard and black English by lower-class black children. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 262-268.

Gefvert, D., Raspa, R., & Richards, A. Keys to American English. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.

Golinkoff, R. M. A comparison of reading comprehension processes in good and poor readers. Reading Research Quarterly, 1976, 11, 623-659.

Goodman, K. S., & Buck, C. Dialect barriers to reading comprehension revisited. The Reading Teacher, 1973, 27, 6-12.

Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. Learning about psycholinguistic processes by analyzing oral reading. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47, 317-333.

Gray, B. Q. Dialect interference in writing: A tripartite analysis. Basic Writing, 1975, 1, 14-22.

Green, D. W., & Shallice, T. Direct visual access in reading for meaning. Memory and Cognition, 1976, 4, 753-758.

Guthrie, John T., & Tyler, S. J. Psycholinguistic processing in reading and listening among good and poor readers. Journal of Reading Behavior, 1976, 8, 415-426.

Hakuta, K., & Cancino, H. Trends in second-language-acquisition research. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47, 294-316.

Hall, V. C., & Turner, R. R. The validity of the 'different language explanation' for poor scholastic performance by black students. Review of Educational Research, 1975, 45, 247-262.

Harber, J. R., & Beatty, J. N. (Comps.), Reading and the black English speaking child. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1978.

Harber, J. R., & Bryen, D. N. Black English and the task of reading. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 387-405.

Harris, M. M. Oral and written syntax attainments of second graders. Research in the Teaching of English, 1977, 11, 117-132.

Hartwell, P. The great punctuation game. Freshman English News, Fall, 1978, 7, no. 1, 16-17.

Hartwell, P. A writing laboratory model. In L. N. Kasden & D. Hoebner (Eds.), Basic writing: A collection of essays for teachers, researchers, and administrators. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, in press.

Hatch, E. Discourse analysis. In E. Hatch (Ed.), Studies in second language acquisition: A book of readings. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1979.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. Philosophy of composition. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1977.

Hoyt, F. S. The place of grammar in the elementary curriculum. Teachers College Record, 1906, 7, 1-34.

Ingvar, D. H. Functional landscapes of the dominant hemisphere. Brain Research, 1976, 107, 181-197.

Kinneavy, J. L. Paper forthcoming in D. A. Daiker, A. Kerek, & M. Morenberg (Eds.), Sentence Combining and the Teaching of English. Akron, Ohio: L&S Press, in press.

Kintgen, E. R. Psycholinguistics and literature. College English, 1978, 39, 755-769.

Kirschner, S. A., & Poteet, G. H. Non-standard English usage in the writing of black, white, and Hispanic remedial English students in an urban community college. Research in the Teaching of English, 1973, 7, 351-355.

Kochman, T. Culture and communication: Implications for black English in the classroom. Florida FL Reporter, Spring/Summer, 1969, 7, 89-92, 172-174.

Kolers, P. A. Experiments in reading. Scientific American, July, 1972, 227, no. 7, 84-91.

Kroll, B. M., & Schafer, J. C. Error-analysis and the teaching of English. College Composition and Communication, 1978, 19, 242-248.

La Berge, D., & Samuels, S. J. Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 1974, 5, 84-91.

Labov, W. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

Labov, W. The logic of nonstandard English. Georgetown University Monographs in Languages and Linguistics, no. 22, 1969. (Reprinted in Labov, 1972.)

Labov, W. Language in the inner city. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Lassen, N. A., Ingvar, D. H., & Skinhj, E. Brain function and blood flow. Scientific American, October, 1978, 239, no. 10, 62-71.

Lin, S. C. Pattern practice in the teaching of standard English to students with a non-standard dialect. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Linn, M. D. Black rhetorical patterns and the teaching of composition. College Composition and Communication, 1975, 26, 149-153.

Liu, S. S. F. An investigation of oral reading miscues made by nonstandard dialect speaking black children. Reading Research Quarterly, 1976, 11, 193-197.

Lyman, R. L. English grammar in American schools before 1850. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Interior, 1921. Bureau of Education Bulletin, no. 12.

Makita, Kiyoshi. Reading disability and the writing system. In J. E. Merritt (Ed.), New horizons in reading. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1976.

Marwit, S. J., & Neumann, G. Black and white children's comprehension of standard and nonstandard English passages. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 329-332.

McDermott, R. P. Achieving school failure: An anthropological approach to illiteracy and social stratification. In G. Spindler (Ed.), Education and cultural process: Toward an anthropology of education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1974.

Marshall, J. C., & Newcombe, F. Patterns of paralexics: A psycholinguistic approach. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 1973, 2, 175-199.

Meckel, H. C. Research on the teaching of composition and literature. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Mencken, H. L. The schoolma'am's goal. In his Prejudices: Fifth series. New York: Knopf, 1926.

Menyuk, P. Relations between the acquisition of phonology and reading. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), Aspects of reading acquisition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Morse, J. M. "The shuffling speech of slavery: Black English. College English, 1973, 34, 834-839.

Morse, J. M. 'Keepum Ignunt.' Chronicle of Higher Education, January 22, 1979, p. 80.

Moscowitz, A. On the status of vowel shift in English. In T. E. Moore (Ed.), Cognitive development and the acquisition of language. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Olson, D. R. Oral and written language and the cognitive processes of children. Journal of Communication, 1977, 27, no. 3, 10-26.

Olson, D. R. From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47, 257-281.

Park, S., & Arbuckle, T. Y. Ideograms versus alphabets: Effects of script on memory in 'biscriptal' Korean subjects. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 1977, 3, 631-642.

Perfetti, C. A., & Goldman, S. R. Discourse memory and reading comprehension skill. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1976, 15, 33-42.

Petrosky, A. R. Grammar instruction: What we know. English Journal, 1977, 66, no. 9, 86-88.

Piché, G. L., et al. Effects of dialect-ethnicity, social class and quality of written compositions on teachers' subjective evaluations of children. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 60-72.

Piché, G. L., et al. Teachers' subjective evaluations of standard and black nonstandard English compositions: A study of written language and attitudes. Research in the Teaching of English, 1978, 12, 107-118.

Rayburn, J. A. An investigation of selected syntactic differences present in the oral and written language of lower socioeconomic status black third and fifth graders. Diss., Indiana University, 1974.

Reed, C. E. Adapting TESOL approaches to the teaching of written standard English as a second dialect to speakers of American black English vernacular. TESOL Quarterly, 1973, 7, 289-307.

Rockas, L. Teaching literacy. College Composition and Communication, 1977, 28, 273-275.

Samuels, S. J., Begy, G., & Chen, C. C. Comparison of word recognition speed and strategies of skilled and more highly skilled readers. Reading Research Quarterly, 1975, 11, 72-86.

Schachter, J., & Celce-Muria, M. Some reservations concerning error analysis. TESOL Quarterly, 1977, 11, 441-451.

Schumann, J. Social distance as a factor in second language learning. Language Learning, 1976, 26, 135-143.

Schwartz, S., & Doehring, D. G. A developmental study of children's ability to acquire knowledge of spelling patterns. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13, 419-420.

Shallice, T., & Warrington, E. K. Word recognition in a phonemic dislexic patient. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1975, 27, 187-199.

Shankwiler, D., & Liberman, I. Misreading: A search for causes. In J. Kavanagh & I. Mattingly (Eds.), Language by ear and by eye. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1972.

Shaughnessy, M. Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1977.

Simons, H. D. Black dialect phonology and word recognition. Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 68, 67-70.

Simons, H. D., & Johnson, K. R. Black English syntax and reading interference. Research in the Teaching of English, 1974, 8, 339-358.

Sims, R. What we know about dialects and reading. In P. D. Allen & D. J. Watson (Eds.), Findings of research in miscue analysis: Classroom implications. Urbana: Educational Resources Information Center and the National Council of Teachers of English, 1976.

Sledd, J. Language differences and literary values: Divagations from a theme. College English, 1976, 38, 234-241.

Smith, F. Understanding reading. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978.

Smitherman, G. Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977.

Sherwin, J. S. Four problems in teaching English: A critique of research. Scranton: International Textbook Company, 1969.

Somervill, M. A. Dialect and reading: A review of alternative solutions. Review of Educational Research, 1975, 45, 247-262.

Sternglass, M. Close similarities in dialect features of black and white college students in remedial composition classes. TESOL Quarterly, 1974, 8, 271-283.

Sternglass, M. Dialect features in the compositions of black and white college students in remedial composition classes: The same or different? College Composition and Communication, 1974, 25, 259-263.

Stockwell, R. P., & Macaulay, R. K. S. (Eds.), Linguistic Change and generative theory. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Pr., 1972.

Strom, I. M. Research in grammar and usage and its implications for teaching writing. Bulletin of the School of Education (Indiana University), 1960, 36.

Stroud, R. A study of the relation between social differences of white and Negro high school students of Dayton, Ohio. Master's thesis, Bowling Green State University, 1956.

Terrebone, N. G. The black English vernacular in the writing of young adults from Dayton, Ohio. Diss., Louisiana State University, 1975.

Torrey, J. W. Teaching standard English to speakers of other dialects. In G. E. Perren & J. L. M. Trim (Eds.), Applications of linguistics: Selected papers of the second international conference of applied linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1971.

Vatchek, J. Written language. The Hague: Mouton, 1973.

Vygotsky, L. S. Language and thought. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Vygotsky, L. S. The prehistory of written language. In his Mind in society. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1978.

Waller, T. G. Children's recognition memory of written sentences: A comparison of good and poor readers. Child Development, 1976, 47, 90-95.

Warnock, J. New rhetoric and the grammar of pedagogy. Freshman English News, 1976, 5, no. 1, 1-4, 12-22.

Weber, R. Some reservations on the significance of a dialect in the acquisition of reading. In J. A. Figurel (Ed.), Reading goals for the disadvantaged. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1970.

Whiteman, M. F. Dialect influence and the writing of black and white working class Americans. Diss., Georgetown University, 1976.

Winterowd, W. R. Contemporary rhetoric: A conceptual background with readings. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975.

Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.) The human brain. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Wright, E. C. School English and social order: Nineteenth century background to the work of the committee of ten and its conference on English. Diss., Northwestern University, 1977.

Young, R. E. Paradigms and problems: Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Research on Composing: Points of departure. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1978.